



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,769	07/28/2006	Sami Saribas	019957-016830US	2116
20350 7590 08/04/2009 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER MEAH, MOHAMMAD Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1652				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/587,769

Applicant(s)

SARIBAS ET AL.

Examiner

MD. YOUNUS MEAH

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-11 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,7-11 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/02/2009 has been entered.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11 and 14 were examined in the previous action.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11 and 14 are currently pending in the instant application.

Applicants' arguments filed on 07/02/2009 have been fully considered but they are found unpersuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn.

Claim objections

Claim 1 is objected to for lack of consistency - parts (a)-(b) refer to a eukaryotic protein but there is no mention of the term "eukaryotic" in the preamble with regard to the ST3Gal3 protein. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 11 is objected to for reciting "substrate is selected from ". It should be changed to "substrate is selected from the group consisting of". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 14 is objected to for reciting "substrate is selected from ". It should be changed to "substrate is selected from the group consisting of". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C 112 2nd Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 14 is indefinite because it depends from claim 12, which is now canceled, so it is unclear which claim is being further limited by claim 14. For examination purposes Examiner will interpret the claim to be dependent upon claim 1.

Claims 2 is indefinite in the recitation of "ST3Gal3 protein is truncated" for the following reasons: Claim 2 requires truncation of the ST3Gal3 protein. The variant which results from truncating part of the protein is no longer considered the same ST3Gal3 being refolded in claim 1. Thus the ST3Gal3 protein of claim 2 is not the same as that of claim 1. Furthermore the truncation should occur during/after the refolding process. However, as known in the art, truncation is achieved via molecular biology techniques, so one would understand that truncation should occur prior to refolding. In fact, that is what the specification describes in the discussion of different techniques to facilitate refolding. For examination purpose Examiner will interpret the claim as being independent claim directed to a method of refolding where the protein to be refolded is a ST3Gal3 protein lacking part of or its entire stem region.

Claims 3 is indefinite in the recitation of "unpaired cysteine in the ST3Gal3 protein is removed by substitution with a non-cysteine residue" for the following reasons. Claim 3 requires substitution of an unpaired cysteine residue with a non-cysteine residue of the ST3Gal3 protein. The variant which results from substitution of an unpaired cysteine residue with a non-cysteine residue of the protein is no longer considered the same ST3Gal3 being refolded in claim 1. Thus the ST3Gal3 protein of claim 3 is not the same as that of claim 1. Furthermore the substitution should occur during/after the refolding process. However, as known in the art, substitution is achieved via molecular biology techniques, so one would understand that changes should occur prior to refolding. In fact, that is what the specification describes in the discussion of different techniques to facilitate refolding. For examination purpose the Examiner will interpret the claim as being independent claim directed to a method of refolding where the protein to be refolded is a ST3Gal3 variant wherein said variant results from substituting an unpaired cysteine with a non-cysteine amino acid.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C 103a

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

Obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 7, 10-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulson et al (US patent 5858751) in view of Hellman et al (protein expr, pur. 1995, 6, 56-62, from IDS) and Clark et al (Current opin. Biotech. 2001, 202-207, from IDS). This rejection is maintained as discussed at length in the previous office action and discussed it again.

Claims 1 and 14 are directed to a method of refolding insoluble eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) protein by solubilizing in a solubilizing buffer and refolding using a refolding buffer comprising a redox couple wherein the refolded ST3Gal3 catalyzes the transfer of sialic acid sugar from a donor to an acceptor substrate. Claim 2 is directed to a method to refold an insoluble eukaryotic ST3Gal3 which lacks part of or all of its stem region wherein said method requires solubilizing the insoluble eukaryotic protein using a refolding buffer comprising a redox couple. Claim 7 is directed to the method of claim 1 wherein said eukaryotic ST3Gal3 is expressed in a bacterial host cell as an insoluble inclusion body. Claim 10 is directed to the method of claim 1 wherein said eukaryotic ST3Gal3 is refolded by using GSH/GSSG. Claim 11 is directed to the method of claim 1 wherein said acceptor is a protein, peptide glycoprotein or glycopeptide. acid.

Paulson et al. teach multiple methods and expression of various eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferases (ST3Gal3) in eukaryotic and prokaryotic organisms (whole document) including expression of mutated proteins particularly derivatives lacking the stem region (column 75, claim 4) and teach the transferring of sialic acid from a CMP-sialic acid donor (column 7 lines 15-20) to a glycoprotein (column 4 lines 22-30).

Paulson is silent regarding maltose binding domain and the refolding of the alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) using a buffer comprising a redox system.

Clark et al teach a method of isolation, purification and refolding of insoluble proteins from inclusion bodies (page 202, column 2) using a disulfide bond forming redox buffer such as GSH/GSSG (page 205, column 1). Clark does not teach refolding alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) nor teach fusion protein comprising maltose binding domain.

Hellman et al teach solubilizing an insoluble protein from inclusion bodies by expression of an N-terminal fusion of the desired protein with maltose binding domain (MBD) (such as, MBD fusion of CGT(cyclomaltodextrin glucanotransferase), see page 60, column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Paulson et al, Hellman et al and Clark et al to produce a biologically active soluble eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) by expressing in a prokaryotic organism a fusion protein consisting of ST3Gal3 and the well known purification MBD tag, solubilize the inclusion bodies and refold using a refolding buffer comprising reduced glutathione/oxidized glutathione (GSH/GSSG).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferases (ST3Gal3) are used in the production of other glycosylated proteins and/or specific oligosaccharides that are useful as pharmaceuticals for the treatment of various disorders (Paulson et al column 2 lines 38-68). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been also motivated to express the

eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase in prokaryotic system because i) use of prokaryotes in recombinant production proteins is well known in the art, ii) prokaryotic system is commercially available (cheaper to produce), iii) It is easier to purify recombinant proteins of interest from prokaryotes, iv) prokaryotic systems are potentially free of eukaryotic pathogens. Maltose binding domain (MBD) is a very well known as a purification tag (Hellman et al.). One of skill in the art would have been motivated to express the eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) as a fusion protein comprising MBD in a prokaryotic system.

Therefore a skilled artisan would be motivated to employ well known prokaryotic recombinant expression system to produce a fusion protein comprising the alpha(2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) and the MBD and to use the method of Clark et al. to refold the said fusion protein to produce alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) on a large scale and apply the method of Hellman et al (applying MBD fusion) and Clark et al to refold (using redox buffer such as GSH/GSSG) the said protein in an active form so that it catalyzes the transfer of sialic acid sugar from a CMP-sialic acid to galactose containing substrate. There is a reasonable expectation of success in view of the fact that Clark teach that the recited method can be applied to any insoluble protein, the use of MBD fusion proteins is well known in the art as evidenced by Hellman et al and the recombinant production of proteins in prokaryotic cells is well known and widely practiced in the art. Therefore, the claimed method as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Arguments and response

Applicants' argue, at page 2-6 of their amendment of 07/02/2009, that the one of ordinary skill in the art although would have had a reason to modify the teachings of the cited art to recombinantly produce eukaryotic α -(2,3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) of Paulson et al using methods of Clark and Hellman, s/he would not have had reasonable expectation of success of obtaining a solubilized and refolded ST3Gal3 protein comprising a maltose binding protein starting from an insoluble protein because production of solubilized and refolded ST3Gal3 protein comprising a maltose binding protein would not have been predictable. Applicants argue that none of the three references teach or suggest obtaining soluble active ST3Gal3 by refolding insoluble protein from inclusion body.

Applicants' arguments filed on 07/02/2009 have been fully considered, but they found unpersuasive. There is nothing unpredictable or unexpected from obtaining an active enzyme purified from inclusion bodies. Many proteins and enzymes have been over expressed and purified from inclusion bodies (Hellman *et al*). It is well known in prior art, how to produce biologically active soluble eukaryotic proteins by expressing in a prokaryotic organism by a fusion of the protein with the MBD tag, solubilize from the inclusion bodies and refold using refolding buffer, see Hellman *et al*, Bach *et al* (J. Mol. Biol. 2001, 312, pp 79-93, from IDS); Kapust *et al* (Protein Sci 199, 8, pp 1668-1674, from IDS). Applicants' argument that none of the references disclose obtaining soluble active ST3Gal3 by refolding insoluble protein from inclusion body is true, if they do, they would anticipate applicants' invention. However, as indicated above, the three references provide not only the individual elements of the claimed method but also the

motivation to combine these elements as well as a reasonable expectation of success at obtaining a soluble active eukaryotic ST3Gal3 by over expressing said eukaryotic ST3Gal3 as MBP fusion protein in a prokaryotic organism, solubilizing the inclusion under denaturing conditions, and refolding the fusion protein in appropriate buffer comprising GSH/GSSG for proper formation of disulfide linkages.

Applicant further argue that Paulson et al produce recombinant eukaryotic sialyltransferases using eukaryotic expression systems and did not use prokaryotic expression systems. Although Paulson et al. did not provide a working example, the reference still teaches expression in prokaryotic systems (column 10 lines 37-46) and there is no reason to believe that such teaching is not enabled in view of the fact that production of eukaryotic proteins in prokaryotic systems is well known (Clark et al, introduction section) and widely practiced in the art.

Applicant further argue that Hellman et al teach solubilizing insoluble cyclomaltodextrin glucanotransferase protein from inclusion bodies by expression of N-terminal fusion of desired protein with maltose binding domain (MBD) and which is different from alpha (2,3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) recited in applicants' present claims. However, Hellman et al teaching of solubilizing insoluble cyclomaltodextrin glucanotransferase from inclusion bodies by expressing MBD fusion of said protein could be used for solubilizing alpha (2,3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) from inclusion bodies by N-terminal fusion of the protein with maltose binding domain (MBD). Applicant further argue that Hellman admits that "each protein seems to require a specific denaturation-refolding pathway to give a maximal yield of functional molecules"

which discourage one of ordinary skill in the art to use MBD domain for solubilizing alpha (2,3) sialyltransferase. Applicant's arguments found to be unpersuasive. Hellman et al are talking about specific denaturation-refolding pathways and not the disadvantage of using MBD domain for solubilizing protein from inclusion bodies.

As it was discussed above, the use of maltose binding domain to solubilize and purify insoluble proteins from inclusion bodies of prokaryotic expression systems is well known in prior art (Hellman et al, Bach et al, J. Mol. Biol. 2001, 312, pp 79-93, from IDS; Kapust et al Protein Sci 199, 8, pp 1668-1674, from IDS)., Also well known in the art is the refolding of folded protein using a disulfide bond forming redox buffer such as GSH/GSSG (Clark et al). Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Paulson et al., Hellman et al and Clark et al to produce a biologically active soluble eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) by expressing in a prokaryotic organism a fusion protein consisting of ST3Gal3 and the well known purification MBD tag, solubilize the inclusion bodies and refold using a refolding buffer comprising reduced glutathione/oxidized glutathione (GSH/GSSG).

Applicants argue that Clark is a review article which discloses general approaches for protein refolding for industrial processes, but Clark does not disclose results for any particular protein. Applicants' refer to the Winter et al. showing that "the addition of glutathione had a negative effect on the yield of native proinsulin" thus suggesting unpredictability of success with glutathione in redox systems (Attachment 1- Winter et al., Increased production of human proinsulin in the periplasmic space of Escherichia coli by fusion to DsbA, Journal of Biotechnology, 2000, 84:175-185; page

183, column 2, lines 17-24). Applicants' argument is considered but found unpersuasive. Use of GSH/GSSG for refolding protein via proper formation of disulfide linkages is well known in the art (Clark et al and various references cited therein). Winter et al., teach that formation of correct disulfide bonds is not the problem in the case of proinsulin (page 183 2nd column lines 23-29). In the case of proinsulin, Winter et al teach that GSH/GSSG effects the yield of proinsulin but GSH/GSSG does not have an effect on the disulfide bond formation in refolding the protein.

Applicants argument using the Attached reference 2 ("Fahnert B., Folding-promoting agents" in recombinant protein production, Methods in Molecular Biology, 2004, 267:53-74) is considered. Applicants argue that Fahnert had reviewed many protocols published over the years and concluded that "it becomes clear quite soon that as every target protein is different, one cannot predict the effect of a certain approach. Most of the time one cannot even speculate" (Fahnert, page 60, last paragraph). The argument is found unpersuasive. Fahnert's whole article refers to in-vivo protein folding in expression cells (abstract) not refolding protein in a buffered medium. Instant application is directed to in-vitro refolding of a protein in a buffered medium, not protein folding in an in-vivo system. As discussed above refolding proteins using buffered medium using refolding agent are well known in art (see Clark et al).

Applicants have provided no evidence or a reasonable scientific argument to support surprising or unexpected results. Thus, the claimed invention remains *prima facie* obvious over the prior art of record.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulson et al (US patent 5858751) in view of Hellman et al (protein expr, pur. 1995, 6, 56-62, from IDS) and Clark et al (Current opin. Biotech. 2001, 202-207, from IDS) and further in view of Ramakrishnan et al (J. Biol. Chem. 2001, 276, 37665-37671). This rejection is maintained as discussed at length in the previous office action and discussed it again.

The teachings of Paulson et al., Hellman et al and Clark et al are summarized above.

Ramakrishnan et al teach that mutation of an unpaired cysteine, Cys342 to Thr of a beta-galactosyltransferase resulted in 2 to 3 fold increase in yield of refolded enzyme (compare to unmutated enzyme, page 37666, 1st column last paragraph)).

It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Paulson et al., Hellman et al and Clark et al with the teachings of Ramakrishnan et al to produce a biologically active soluble eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) in high yield by expressing in a prokaryotic organism a fusion protein comprising an ST3Gal3 protein which has been mutated such that the unpaired cysteine residues have been substituted with non-cysteine residues (as taught Ramakrishnan et al) and the well known MBD tag, solubilize from the inclusion bodies and refold using refolding buffer in order to get better yield of refolded protein.

Arguments and response

Applicants' argument, at page 6 of their amendment of 7/2/09, against claim 3 have been fully considered, but they found unpersuasive, as explained above in the

response against the argument for the Claims 1-2, 7, 10-11 and 14. Applicants' further argue that Ramakrishnan et al worked with a different protein and that there is no way to reasonably predict a successful outcome using ST3Gal3. Applicants' argument have been fully considered, but they found unpersuasive. Examiner acknowledges that the reference uses a different protein but that a minimum, one of skill in the art would have been motivated to make the substitution in view of the successful results of Ramakrishnan and that there is a reasonable expectation of success at substituting the cysteine residues because the molecular biology techniques required are well known in the art. Applicants' further argue that they obtained unexpected results and that one of skill in the art would not have been able to reasonably predict the outcome. Applicants' argument have been fully considered, but they found unpersuasive. Applicants' method as claimed requires not just making the substitution of the cysteine residues for refolding but also exposing the protein to a refolding buffer comprising a redox couple. As long as there is a reasonable expectation of success at refolding the recited protein by using a refolding buffer containing a redox couple, that is all that is required by the claims. Whether the substitution of the cysteine residues increases the refolding yield or not is irrelevant because there is no limitation requiring any particular level of refolding or any particular yield.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulson et al (US patent 5858751) in view of Hellman et al (protein expr, pur. 1995, 6, 56-62, from IDS), Clark et al Current opin. Biotech. 2001, 202-207, from IDS) and further in view of Nilsson et al. (Protein expression and purification 1997, 11, pp 1-16, IDS). This

rejection is maintained as discussed at length in the previous office action and discussed it again.

Claim 5 is directed to the method of claim 1 wherein said eukaryotic ST3Gal3 further comprise purification domain selected from the group consisting of a starch binding domain, a thioredoxin domain, and poly-his domain.

The teachings of Paulson et al., Hellman et al and Clark et al are summarized above.

It is well known in prior art that a convenient method of purification of protein is make a fusion protein wherein target protein is fused with one or more affinity tags (such as one or more affinity tags from the group of maltose binding domain, starch binding domain, a thioredoxin domain, glutathione-S-transferase (GST) domain and poly-HIS domain, Nilsson et al.). Nilsson et al. teach the use of two affinity tags attached to target protein (table 2, GST and Poly-HIS domains, page 5, 1st column 2nd paragh.) and purify the target protein using two affinity columns (Fig 4 at page 8).

It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Paulson et al., Hellman et al and Clark et al to produce a biologically active soluble eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) by expressing in prokaryotic organism a fusion protein consisting of ST3Gal3 and the well known purification MBD tag with the teachings of Nilsson et al. to add a second purification tag such as, poly-HIS domain, solubilize said protein having MBD tag and the 2nd purification tag from the inclusion bodies and refold using refolding buffer and purify by

using two affinity columns so that said purified ST3Gal3 catalyzes the transfer of sialic acid sugar from a CMP-sialic acid to galactose containing substrate.

Arguments and response

Applicants' argument, at page 6 of their amendment of 12/ 22/08, against claim 5 have been fully considered, but they found unpersuasive, as explained above in the response against the argument for the Claims 1-2, 7, 10-11 and 14. Applicants' further argue that Nilsson et al. did not work or suggest fusion of MBD with ST3Gal3.

Applicants' argument have been fully considered, but they found unpersuasive.

Examiner acknowledges that the reference uses a different protein but that a minimum, one of skill in the art would have been motivated to add an additional purification domain to the fusion protein comprising MBD and ST3Gal3 in view of the successful results of Nilsson et al in the purification of proteins using two or more affinity tags and that there is a reasonable expectation of success at adding an additional purification domain would facilitate the purification using affinity chromatography. Furthermore, there is no evidence that having two purification tags would prevent the refolding of the protein in the method of Paulson, Hellman and Clark, and the method as claimed requires other steps for refolding in addition to the presence of two tags. As long as there is a reasonable expectation of success at refolding by using the buffer containing the redox couple, one of skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success with regard to the method of Paulson, Hellman, Clark and Nilsson.

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulson et al (US patent 5858751) in view of Hellman et al (protein expr, pur. 1995, 6,

56-62, from IDS) and Clark et al Current opin. Biotech. 2001, 202-207, from IDS). This rejection is maintained as discussed at length in the previous office action and discussed it again.

Claims 8-9 are directed to the method of claim 1 wherein one or two additional recombinant eukaryotic glycosyltransferases is (are) refolded with said eukaryotic ST3Gal3.

The teachings of Paulson et al., Hellman et al and Clark et al are summarized above.

It is well known in prior art that most bioactive glycoproteins comprise variety of sugar residues and need multienzymes to produce them (see Paulson et al column 4 lines 21-44). It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, for the production of a multienzyme system to catalyze the transfer (in addition to sialic acid sugar) of sugar moieties from donors to acceptor substrate, to combine the teachings of Paulson et al., Hellman et al and Clark et al to produce biologically active soluble eukaryotic alpha (2, 3) sialyltransferase (ST3Gal3) by expressing in prokaryotic organism a fusion protein consisting ST3Gal3 and the well known MBD purification tag, solubilize from the inclusion bodies and further refold 2 or more glycosyltransferases with it using refolding buffer so that said multienzyme system catalyzes the transfer (in addition to sialic acid sugar) other sugar moieties from donor to acceptor substrate. A skilled artisan would be motivated to solubilize and refold one or two additional recombinant eukaryotic glycosyltransferases with said eukaryotic ST3Gal3 because refolding more enzymes at the same time would save time and

reagents. There is a reasonable expectation of success in view of the fact that Clark teach that the recited method can be applied to any insoluble protein, the use of MBD fusion proteins is well known in the art as evidenced by Hellman et al and the recombinant production of proteins in prokaryotic cells is well known and widely practiced in the art. Therefore, the claimed method as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Arguments and response

Applicants' argument, at page 7 of their amendment of 12/ 22/08, against claim 8 and 9 have been fully considered, but they found unpersuasive, as explained above in the response against the argument for the Claims 1-2, 7, 10-11 and 14.

Allowable Subject Matter/Conclusion

None of the claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Meah whose telephone number is 571-272-1261. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on 571-272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mohammad Younus Meah
Examiner, Art Unit 1652

Application/Control Number: 10/587,769

Page 18

Art Unit: 1652

/Delia M. Ramirez/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652